



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/561,085 | 03/27/2006 | George C. Zguris | 2009018-0032 | 2471 |
| 24280 | 7590 | 09/16/2011 | EXAMINER | |
| CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110 | | | MEKHLIN, ELI S | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1728 | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 09/16/2011 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@choate.com
jhess@choate.com
jnease@choate.com

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/561,085 | Applicant(s) ZGURIS, GEORGE C. | |
| | Examiner ELI MEKHLIN | Art Unit 1728 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19-35 and 39-78 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) 1-17, 19-32 and 76-78 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 33-35 and 39-75 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

(1)

Applicant's amendment filed on August 1, 2011, has been entered. Applicant amended claims 66, 67 and 69. No new matter has been entered. Claims 1-17, 19-35 and 39-78 are pending before the Office for review. Claims 1-17, 19-32 and 76-78 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed toward a non-elected invention.

(2)

Response to Arguments

Examiner acknowledges that during the telephone interview with Applicant on June 21, 2011, Examiner indicated that Applicant's arguments regarding the ground of rejection set forth in the final office action dated March 30, 2011, were persuasive. Examiner further indicated that a new ground of rejection would be relied upon in any subsequent office action. This new ground of rejection is presented below and the previous ground of rejection is withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments filed with respect to the new ground of rejection, as set forth below and in the telephone interview on June 21, 2011, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's first argument is that Shinoda teaches the addition of the fibers to an electrode of an alkaline battery and does not provide a reason for a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to add the fibers to the electrolyte, as required by the claimed invention. Applicant's argument is not persuasive because the characterization of Shinoda's teachings is only partially correct. Shinoda disposes the

Art Unit: 1728

fibers in fiber form in an electrode; however, the electrode comprises a gel-form electrolyte. Shinoda, Col. 5, Lines 20-29 and Col. 7, Lines 55-63. Accordingly, Shinoda teaches depositing fibers in fiber form into an electrode *and* electrolyte.

Holland, as explained by Applicant, uses a fibrous web positioned in the free spaces of a battery to absorb changing free electrolyte volume of the battery.

Accordingly, Holland establishes that the fibrous material absorbs electrolyte.

Shinoda's fiber in fiber form performs the same function. Specifically, Shinoda teaches that the fiber in fiber form "swells by absorbing the electrolyte." Col. 3, Lines 54-55.

Therefore, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have appreciated that using fiber in fiber form can accomplish the same result as the fibrous material taught by Holland.

Finally, Applicant argues that Holland or Shinoda do not teach locating the fiber in fiber form between the electrodes. However, Holland teaches, as seen in Figure 1, that the fibrous material (10, 22) runs along the top and sides of the battery case.

Figure 1. The fibrous material (22) that runs along the sides of the battery case is located in the free space between the inside surface of the case and the edges of the electrode plates and is also positioned on the bottom of the case below the electrode plates, meaning a portion of the fibrous material is located between the electrode plates.

Therefore, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

(3)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 33-34, 39-45, 51-53, 55-60 and 66-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,468,575) in view of Shinoda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,376,480).

With respect to **claim 33**, Holland teaches a high-capacity lead battery. Abstract. Holland further teaches that the battery is constructed by placing a fibrous material in a battery case and combining the fibrous material with an electrolyte. Col. 4, Lines 1-10. The fibrous material extends along the space between the plurality of electrode plates and the separator and the case, meaning that the fibrous material extends between the battery's electrodes. Figure 1 and Col. 4, Lines 1-10. Specifically, the fibrous material (22) that runs along the sides of the battery case is located in the free space between the inside surface of the case and the edges of the electrode plates and is also positioned on the bottom of the case below the electrode plates, meaning a portion of the fibrous material is located between the electrode plates. Figure 1 and Col. 4, Lines 1-10. Holland teaches that the fibrous material is placed in the battery to absorb electrolyte. Abstract.

Although Holland teaches that the battery manufacturing process uses a fibrous material, Holland is silent as to whether the fibrous material can be in fiber form.

However, Shinoda, which deals with battery production, teaches that fibers can be disposed in the electrode area of a battery. Abstract. The electrode area comprises a gel-form electrolyte, meaning the fiber is disposed in the battery electrolyte. Col. 5, Lines 20-29 and Col. 7, Lines 55-63. Shinoda teaches that the fiber in fiber form in the electrolyte improves the impact resistance of the battery. Abstract. Additionally, Shinoda teaches that the fibers, in fiber form, absorb electrolyte, which is consistent with the reason why Holland uses fibrous material. Col. 3, Lines 54-55.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to add the fiber in fiber form to the lead-acid battery comprising fibrous material taught by Holland because Shinoda teaches that do so improves the durability of the battery while also acting as an electrolyte absorbent.

A person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have appreciated that the combination of Holland and Shinoda is the combination of prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results. Holland and Shinoda are both directed toward batteries that comprises electrolyte and fibrous material. Holland's fibrous material is in the form of a web and Shinoda's fibrous material is in fiber form. Both teach that their respective fibrous material absorbs electrolyte. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention could have combined the teachings of Shinoda with those of Holland to add fibers in fiber form to Holland's battery with the expectation that doing so will both increase the amount of electrolyte that can be maintained in the case and improve, to a degree, the impact resistance of the battery. Specifically, Shinoda teaches that adding fiber in fiber form to a battery

Art Unit: 1728

increases the impact resistance of the battery. Abstract. Shinoda further teaches that the fiber swells to absorb electrolyte, meaning that when the fiber in fiber form is disposed in Holland's battery case, more electrolyte can be maintained in the case due to the absorption of the electrolyte. Finally, Holland teaches that electrolyte absorption is important to the functioning of the battery because the absorbed electrolyte is kept away from the pressure control valve. Col. 3, Line 29.

With respect to **claim 34**, Holland teaches that the electrolyte comprises sulfuric acid. Col. 3, Lines 60-64.

With respect to **claim 39**, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have appreciated that when a case is filled with electrolyte, the case is substantially devoid of electrolyte before a first amount of electrolyte is added to the case.

With respect to **claim 40**, Holland further teaches that the battery comprises a plurality of positive and negative electrode plates that are arranged with a separator disposed between a positive electrode and a negative electrode. Col. 3, Lines 51-55.

With respect to **claim 41**, Holland and Shinoda, as combined above, teach that some of the fibrous material (10, 22), both in the fibrous web and in fiber form, can be disposed between the cell group (1) and the battery case cover (11). Holland, Figure 1 and Shinoda, Abstract and Col. 5, Lines 20-29 and Col. 7, Lines 55-63.

With respect to **claim 42**, Holland and Shinoda, as combined above, teach that the battery has a space (fringe volume) between the case and the cell and that the fibrous material (10, 22), both in the fibrous web and in fiber form, can be disposed in

Art Unit: 1728

the space (fringe volume). Holland, Figure 1 and Shinoda, Abstract and Col. 5, Lines 20-29 and Col. 7, Lines 55-63.

With respect to **claim 43**, Holland teaches that the fibrous material is added around the cell, meaning that the cell is constructed before the fibrous material is disposed within the case. Col. 4, Lines 1-10.

With respect to **claim 44**, Holland and Shinoda, as combined above, are silent as to whether the cell is constructed before the electrolyte is disposed within the case or vice versa. However, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have appreciated that, since the electrolyte is an acid-containing fluid, it would have been easier and safer to construct the cell in the case before the electrolyte is added because doing so avoids the potential for acid exposure. Additionally, as discussed above, as per the MPEP, the selection of any order of performing process steps is *prima facie* obvious in the absence of new or unexpected results. MPEP 2144(IV)(C). Accordingly, because Holland teaches that the electrolyte and cell are both added to the battery case, the order in which the components are added is not patentably distinct absent evidence of new or unexpected results.

With respect to **claim 45**, Holland teaches that the battery can be a lead-acid battery. Col. 1, Lines 6-8, Col. 3, Lines 60-64.

With respect to **claim 51**, Holland and Shinoda, as combined above, teach a process for manufacturing a battery wherein a battery having a case comprises a plurality of anode and cathode plates separated by a separator with a fibrous material, both in the fibrous web and in fiber form, disposed in the case and between the plates.

Art Unit: 1728

Holland, Col. 4, Lines 1-10 and Figure 1 and Shinoda, Abstract and Col. 3, Lines 54-55.

The fibrous material extends along the space between the plurality of electrode plates and the separator and the case, meaning that the fibrous material extends between the battery's electrodes. Figure 1 and Col. 4, Lines 1-10. Specifically, the fibrous material (22) that runs along the sides of the battery case is located in the free space between the inside surface of the case and the edges of the electrode plates and is also positioned on the bottom of the case below the electrode plates, meaning a portion of the fibrous material is located between the electrode plates. Figure 1 and Col. 4, Lines 1-10.

With respect to **claim 52**, Holland teaches that an electrolyte is disposed within the case. Col. 4, Lines 1-10.

With respect to **claim 53**, Holland teaches that the electrolyte comprises sulfuric acid. Col. 3, Lines 60-64.

With respect to **claims 55 and 56**, Holland teaches that the electrolyte is disposed in the case before the fibrous material is disposed in the case. Col. 4, Lines 1-10. Additionally, as per the MPEP, the selection of any order of performing process steps is *prima facie* obvious in the absence of new or unexpected results. MPEP 2144(IV)(C). Accordingly, because Holland teaches that the electrolyte and fibrous material are both added to the battery, the order in which the components are added is not patentably distinct absent evidence of new or unexpected results.

With respect to **claim 57**, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have appreciated that when a battery case is filled with electrolyte, the

Art Unit: 1728

case is substantially devoid of any electrolyte before the electrolyte is added to the case.

With respect to **claim 58**, Holland and Shinoda, as combined above, teach that some of the fibrous material (10, 22), both in the fibrous web and in fiber form, can be disposed between the cell group (1) and the battery case cover (11). Holland, Figure 1 and Shinoda, Abstract and Col. 5, Lines 20-29 and Col. 7, Lines 55-63.

With respect to **claim 59**, Holland and Shinoda, as combined above, teach that the battery has a space (fringe volume) between the case and the cell and that the fibrous material (10, 22), both in the fibrous web and in fiber form, can be disposed in the space (fringe volume). Holland, Figure 1 and Shinoda, Abstract and Col. 5, Lines 20-29 and Col. 7, Lines 55-63.

With respect to **claim 60**, Holland teaches that the battery can be a lead-acid battery. Col. 1, Lines 6-8, Col. 3, Lines 60-64.

With respect to **claim 66**, Holland and Shinoda, as combined above, teach a process for manufacturing a battery wherein fibrous material, both in a fibrous web and in fiber form, is disposed within a battery case followed by the addition of electrolyte. Holland, Figure 1 and Col. 4, Lines 1-10 and Shinoda, Abstract and Col. 3, Lines 54-55. Additionally, as per the MPEP, the selection of any order of performing process steps is *prima facie* obvious in the absence of new or unexpected results. MPEP 2144(IV)(C). Accordingly, because Holland and Shinoda, as combined above, teach that the electrolyte and fibrous material are both added to the battery, the order in which the

Art Unit: 1728

components are added is not patentably distinct absent evidence of new or unexpected results.

The fibrous material extends along the space between the plurality of electrode plates and the separator and the case, meaning that the fibrous material extends between the battery's electrodes. Figure 1 and Col. 4, Lines 1-10. Specifically, the fibrous material (22) that runs along the sides of the battery case is located in the free space between the inside surface of the case and the edges of the electrode plates and is also positioned on the bottom of the case below the electrode plates, meaning a portion of the fibrous material is located between the electrode plates. Figure 1 and Col. 4, Lines 1-10.

With respect to **claim 67**, Holland and Shinoda, as combined above, teach a process of manufacturing a battery wherein an electrolyte, fibrous material both in fiber form and in a fibrous web, and a plurality of electrode plates are added to a battery case. Holland, Figure 1 and Col. 4, Lines 1-10 and Shinoda, Abstract and Col. 3, Lines 54-55. The fibrous material is located between the battery electrodes. Holland, Figure 1 and Col. 4, Lines 1-10 and Shinoda, Abstract and Col. 3, Lines 54-55. Additionally, as per the MPEP, the selection of any order of performing process steps is *prima facie* obvious in the absence of new or unexpected results. MPEP 2144(IV)(C). Accordingly, because Holland and Shinoda, as combined above, teach that the electrolyte and fibrous material are both added to the battery, the order in which the components are added is not patentably distinct absent evidence of new or unexpected results.

The fibrous material extends along the space between the plurality of electrode plates and the separator and the case, meaning that the fibrous material extends between the battery's electrodes. Figure 1 and Col. 4, Lines 1-10. Specifically, the fibrous material (22) that runs along the sides of the battery case is located in the free space between the inside surface of the case and the edges of the electrode plates and is also positioned on the bottom of the case below the electrode plates, meaning a portion of the fibrous material is located between the electrode plates. Figure 1 and Col. 4, Lines 1-10.

With respect to **claim 68**, Holland further teaches that the cell comprises a plurality of separators arranged between the pluralities of plates such that for each anode and cathode pair a separator is placed there between. Holland, Figure 1 and Col. 3, Lines 50-55.

With respect to **claim 69**, Holland and Shinoda, as combined above, teach a process of manufacturing a battery wherein an electrolyte, fibrous material, both in fiber form and in a fibrous web, and a plurality of electrode plates are added to a battery case. Holland, Figure 1 and Col. 4, Lines 1-10 and Shinoda, Abstract and Col. 3, Lines 54-55. The fibrous material is located between the battery electrodes. Holland, Figure 1 and Col. 4, Lines 1-10 and Shinoda, Abstract and Col. 3, Lines 54-55. Holland further teaches that the cell comprises a plurality of separators arranged between the pluralities of plates such that for each anode and cathode pair a separator is placed there between. Holland, Figure 1 and Col. 3, Lines 50-55. Finally, as per the MPEP, the selection of any order of performing process steps is *prima facie* obvious in the absence

Art Unit: 1728

of new or unexpected results. MPEP 2144(IV)(C). Accordingly, because Holland and Shinoda, as combined above, teach that the electrolyte and fibrous material are both added to the battery, the order in which the components are added is not patentably distinct absent evidence of new or unexpected results.

The fibrous material extends along the space between the plurality of electrode plates and the separator and the case, meaning that the fibrous material extends between the battery's electrodes. Figure 1 and Col. 4, Lines 1-10. Specifically, the fibrous material (22) that runs along the sides of the battery case is located in the free space between the inside surface of the case and the edges of the electrode plates and is also positioned on the bottom of the case below the electrode plates, meaning a portion of the fibrous material is located between the electrode plates. Figure 1 and Col. 4, Lines 1-10.

(4)

Claims 35, 46, 54 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,468,575) in view of Shinoda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,376,480), as applied to claims 33-34, 39-45, 51-53, 55-60 and 66-69, above, and further in view of Inagaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,150,056).

With respect to **claims 35 and 54**, Holland and Shinoda, as combined above, teach that the electrolyte comprises sulfuric acid but are silent as to whether the electrolyte can comprise potassium hydroxide.

Art Unit: 1728

However, Inagaki, which deals with battery design, teaches that potassium hydroxide can be used as an electrolyte in a battery to help produce a battery with increased energy capacity. Col. 2, Lines 43-48, Col. 6, Lines 41-46.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that potassium hydroxide could also be used in the electrolyte taught by Holland and Shinoda, as combined above, because Inagaki teaches that potassium hydroxide can be used as an electrolyte in the production of batteries with increased capacity.

With respect to **claims 46 and 61**, Inagaki teaches that potassium hydroxide electrolyte can be used in a nickel-metal hydride battery. Col. 6, Lines 46-49.

(5)

Claims 47-50, 62-65 and 70-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,468,575) in view of Shinoda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,376,480), as applied to claims 33-34, 39-45, 51-53, 55-60 and 66-69, above, and further in view of Reher et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0182972).

With respect to **claims 47 and 62**, Holland and Shinoda, as combined above, teach that the fibrous material both in fiber form and in the fibrous web can be polyester but are silent as to whether the fiber can comprise a siliceous material.

However, Reher, which deals with the use of fibrous material in a battery, teaches that fibers in a battery can comprise siliceous material. Paragraph 51.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use siliceous fibers because Reher teaches that such fibers can be used in batteries.

Additionally, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have appreciated that the combination of Holland, Shinoda and Reher is the simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results. Holland and Shinoda teach a prior art base device wherein a fibrous material in fiber form is added to a battery case comprising a fibrous web and used to absorb electrolyte. Reher, which deals with the use of fibrous material in batteries, teaches that the fibers in a fibrous material can be siliceous. A person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have appreciated that the fibers used by Reher could be substituted into the configuration taught by Holland and Shinoda to predictably construct a battery comprising a fibrous material in fiber form and in a fibrous web wherein the fibers comprise siliceous material.

With respect to **claims 48 and 63**, Reher teaches that the glass fiber can have an average length of 0.1 mm to 1.5 mm. Paragraph 53.

With respect to **claims 49 and 64**, Reher teaches that the glass fiber can have an average length of 0.1 mm to 1.5 mm. Paragraph 53.

With respect to **claims 50 and 65**, Reher teaches that the fibers have an average aspect ratio of less than 1,500. Paragraph 63.

With respect to **claims 70-75**, Reher teaches that at least 5 weight percent of the glass fibers pass through a 4x4 mesh shake test before they are used in a lead acid

Art Unit: 1728

battery. Paragraph 59. Additionally, as per the MPEP, “where the only difference between the prior art and the claims [is] a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device [is] not patentably distinct from the prior art device. MPEP 2144.04(IV)(A).

(6)

Claims 47, 49, 62, 64 and 70-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,468,575) in view of Shinoda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,376,480), as applied to claims 33-34, 39-45, 51-53, 55-60 and 66-69, above, and further in view of Zguris (U.S. Patent No. 6,306,539).

With respect to **claims 47 and 62**, Holland and Shinoda, as combined above, teach that the fibrous material both in a fibrous web and in fiber form can be polyester but are silent as to whether the fiber can comprise a siliceous material.

However, Zguris, which deals with the use of fibrous material in a battery, teaches that fibers in a battery can comprise siliceous material. Col. 18, Lines 45-47.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use siliceous fibers because Reher teaches that such fibers can be used in batteries.

Additionally, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have appreciated that the combination of Holland, Shinoda and Zguris is the simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results. Holland and Shinoda teach a prior art base device wherein a fibrous material in fiber

Art Unit: 1728

form is added to a battery case comprising a fibrous web and used to absorb electrolyte. Zguris, which deals with the use of fibrous material in batteries, teaches that the fibers in a fibrous material can be siliceous. A person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have appreciated that the fibers used by Zguris could be substituted into the configuration taught by Holland and Shinoda to predictably construct a battery comprising a fibrous material in fiber form and in a fibrous web wherein the fibers comprise siliceous material.

With respect to **claims 49 and 64**, Holland, Shinoda and Zguris, as combined above, teach that the fibers have a diameter of 0.8 microns. Zguris, Col. 12, Lines 4-9.

With respect to **claims 70-75**, Holland, Shinoda and Zguris, as combined above, teach that glass fibers that are used as fibrous material in batteries have an average diameter of 0.8 microns. Zguris, Col. 12, Lines 4-9. A 4x4 mesh shake test passes fibers through a mesh with a diameter of 4.69 millimeters, which is the equivalent of 4,690 microns. Based on this disclosure, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have appreciated that approximately 100% of glass fibers with a average diameter size of 0.8 microns is capable of passing through a 4x4 mesh shake test because the size of the diameter in the mesh is significantly larger than the average diameter of the glass fibers. Accordingly, at some point prior to being combined with electrolyte, 100% of the glass fibers taught by Zguris are capable of being passed through the 4x4 mesh shake test.

(7)

Claims 48, 50, 63 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,468,575) in view of Shinoda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,376,480) and Zguris (U.S. Patent No. 6,306,539) as applied to claims 47, 49, 62, 64 and 70-75 above, and further in view of Cusick et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,227,009).

With respect to **claims 48 and 63**, Holland, Shinoda and Zguris, as combined above, teach that the fibers in the fibrous material, which is in fiber form and a fibrous web, have a diameter of 0.8 microns but are silent as to the length of the fibers.

However, Cusick, which deals with fibrous material for use in lead-acid batteries, teaches that glass fibers with a length of 1 millimeter can be in lead-acid batteries. Col. 14, Lines 35-37.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a fiber with a length of 1 millimeters in the battery taught by Holland, Shinoda and Zguris, as combined above, because Cusick teaches that fibers of that length can be effectively used in lead-acid batteries.

With respect to **claims 50 and 65**, Holland, Shinoda, Zguris and Cusick, as combined above, teach that the glass fibers have an average diameter of 0.8 microns and an average length of 1.0 millimeters. This means that the fibers have an average aspect ratio of 1250, which is less than 1,500.

(8)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ELI MEKHLIN whose telephone number is (571)270-7597. The examiner can normally be reached on 5/4/9.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jennifer K. Michener can be reached on 571-272-1424. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ELI S MEKHLIN/
Examiner, Art Unit 1728

/Jennifer K. Michener/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1728